

**U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Roseburg District, Oregon**

Swiftwater Recreation Sites Programmatic Actions

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, has analyzed a proposal called the **Swiftwater Recreation Sites Programmatic Actions**. In the proposed action, catastrophic repair of damaged recreation sites, scheduled maintenance, as well as upgrades or improvements to current recreation sites and trails would occur. The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-03-02, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

- 1). Approximately 365 acres were analyzed for potential impacts.
- 2). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, page 8) or cultural resources (EA, page 8).
- 3). Consultation with the **US Fish & Wildlife Service** has been completed under the Biological Opinion (February 21, 2003) which concluded that the proposed action is " . . . not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the bald eagle, white-tailed deer, spotted owl or murrelet or adversely modify designated critical habitat for spotted owl or murrelets".
- 4). The BLM has made a determination that this project would be a "no effect" for listed fish species, therefore consultation with the **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration** - fisheries (NOAA) was not required.

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP) dated June 2, 1995*. Two alternatives were analyzed: the "no action" and a proposed action alternative.

Finding of No Significant Impacts: I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. In accordance with the Standards and Guidelines (S&G's, pg. B-10) I find that "the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives" and "meets" or "does not prevent attainment" of these objectives.

Jay K. Carlson
Swiftwater Field Manager

Date

Test for Significant Impacts. (40 CFR 1508.27)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: No identified impacts are judged to be severe.

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: Considering the remoteness of the project to local population centers, and the design criteria governing the proposal (EA, pg. 5 through 7), the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) does not show that the proposed action would adversely affect any of the above characteristics (EA, pg. 17).

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: No controversial effects were noted as a result of environmental analysis or public review.

5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.

6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The repair of damaged recreation sites, conduct of scheduled maintenance, as well as upgrades or improvements to current recreation sites and trails is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: We find that this action would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.

8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: The EA (pg. 8) does not indicate that this action would not adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?

Aquatic Species ☐ Yes ☒ No

Botanical Species ☐ Yes ☒ No

Terrestrial Species ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: "No effect" for listed fish species, therefore consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - fisheries was not required. Botanical surveys did not identify the presence of any T&E plants therefore consultation was not required. Consultation with the Fish & Wildlife Service (February 21, 2003) concluded that the activity "not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the bald eagle, white-tailed deer, spotted owls, murrelets and their critical habitat".

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.